

Creation Versus Evolution

Post Reply Post Reply Page

4

<1 2345>

Author Message Topic Rating Rate Topic Topic Search Topic Search Topic Options
Topic Options

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 27 September 2007 at 10:23pm

To give you the respect you deserve I'll respond to you when I'm not done.

Back to Top

Sponsored Links

Back to Top

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984

Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 28 September 2007 at 9:24am

1) life started in some goo of organic compounds

2) that speciation occurred (something becoming a reptile and a mammal for instance)

In other words, because an elephant, isolated on an island over time becomes small, does not imply, that 1 or 2 are true, which is at the heart of evolution.

There is not a single shred of evidence that strongly supports one and two. They have tampered and tweaked the definition of "speciation" so that one could include fruit flies that have rapid growth that another group of fruit flies does not have as two different species. Smoking mirrors!

Analdu,

I'm confused at your question because you are saying two things here. From what I'm reading are you asking how does evolution prove that all life started out as an "organic soup?" And also how does speciation occur from this?????

There is no evidence to show that random mutations have created us as a distinct species. That is speculation. Your claim does try and fit into the extremely loose use of the concept of "mutation giving rise to speciation".

The evolutionist must prove that mutations started life, and that life grew into some other species.

In the above bold you are asking how evolution proves life began (a third question) which is the wrong one to ask. If you want answers to the actual scientific theory on explain how Earth had the compounds to produce life you would have to seek out astronomist. Just briefly off topic some scientist introduce the theory that in the

prehistoric times the Earth (prior to the existence of dinosaurs) was bombarded by meteors and comets and these introduce the life giving compositions in earth. Hydrogen, Oxygen and Carbon dioxide (including other gases) including bacteria were all compositions in the order of creation of life. Evolution does not explain how life develops but how organisms evolve and adapt. Two different theories here.

evolution fails to explain the very basics of "cellular" evolution because it fails to show just how complicated systems came into being. As an example, the blood clotting system. The blood clotting system must have two essential components: clotting at the right time and place. If not, the system will die. It is that simple. The blood clotting system is extremely complicated, and it is also in the most simplistic form (you cannot take away or add to it). To use the idea of cellular evolution would only show the extreme weakness of the theory and the reason why evolution is a "dead end". If you say that the blood clotting system came into being through random mutations, then you must show how the system worked with only a one or two or a few basic elements. Of course this would be impossible given that nothing can be taken away or added without destroying the system thus killing the organism. The system is "irreducible". The chances that the system "just" came into being from some huge random dice roll is impossible.

Brother Andalus your asking questions that seem to show you have no real knowledge on evolution. After reading Charles Darwin's book in college (including updated material) I don't think Darwin's theory was to show the complexity of cellular division rather, to show how organisms evolved in certain conditions and to show how this occurred. Later refined explanations showed how "genetic drift" plays a role in this development. I'm surprised you didn't read that part. The complexity of the blood clotting system has nothing to do with evolution and everything to do with the physiological structure. The basis of natural selection was that species that were able to adapt into a certain environment thrived versus those that didn't. The species that survived passed on their genes which produced offspring with the same genetic composition as the the previous.

A good example are the Gallapagos (I might have mutilated that name) Island birds. Darwin spent some years looking at these birds. On the Island when it rains the seeds that the birds eat in the trees shrink therefore large beak birds are unable to pick the seeds up, but smaller beak birds are able to therefore, the large beak birds eventually starve and die while the smaller beak birds survive. During a dry spell it is the opposite. Because the seeds become too large the large beak birds thrive and small beak birds die off.

Once more, none of this supports that founding ideas of evolution. I have personally heard supporters and scientists state that macro changes (adaptation) automatically gives "micro" (different species forming, life from nothing, etc). This is a fallacy.

Now I feel like I'm going back to highschool with this but all life comes from a single celled organism, this has been proven. Since this transformation (e.g. from water animals to land animals) all humans have one ancestor that descended from the central southern regions of Africa. From this came the migration eastward in to the Eurasian continents. From thousands upon thousands of years (maybe hundreds of thousands) came the development of different adaptations. Humans began to change. It is obvious from the different types of ethnic groups and skin pigmentations you would think this is the case. I mean Andalus come on. All humans share the same genetic stuff so how would you would theorize how we are so externally different?

Come on brother!!!! lol

[Back to Top](#)

[Andalus View Drop Down](#)

[Moderator Group](#)

[Moderator Group](#)

Joined: 12 October 2005

Location: United States

Status: Offline

Points: 1187 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Andalus](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 28 September 2007 at 8:33pm

Originally posted by Israfil Israfil wrote:

1) life started in some goo of organic compounds

2) that speciation occurred (something becoming a reptile and a mammal for instance)

In other words, because an elephant, isolated on a island over time becomes small, does not imply, that 1 or 2 are true, which is at the heart of evolution.

There is not a single shred of evidence that strongly supports one and two. They have tampered and tweaked the definition of "speciation" so that one could include fruit flies that have hair growth that another group of fruit flies does not have as two different species. Smoking mirrors!

Analdu,

I'm confused at your question because you are saying two things here.

LOL...yes of course I am saying two things, I even numbered them as two things, one and two. Two points that evolution fails to prove or even predict (a "real" scientific theory should make predictions, evolution has not been able to predict anything, and being a "tautology", it always agrees with everything after the fact!).

My question was actually a proposition: evolution fails on two major points, and the proponents like to hide behind the banner of "adaptation" to promote the theory, but the novice usually fails to see the smoking mirrors and see that adaptation does not prove the bases of evolution: life came from nothing, and mutations cause speciation.

Quote

From what I'm reading are you asking how does evolution prove that all life started out as an "organic soup?" And also how does speciation occur from this?????

I stated that rather clearly? I am going a bit further to emphasize that evolution fails to prove either.

Quote

There is no evidence to show that random mutations have created us as a distinct species. That is speculation. Your claim does try and fit into the extremely loose use of the concept of "mutation giving rise to speciation".

The evolutionist must prove that mutations started life, and that life grew into some other species.

In the above bold you are asking how evolution proves life began (a third question) which is the wrong one to ask.

Actually it is a very salient direction that I used. Evolutionist claim that they have not just a theory, but a proven factual theory that explains how life began and developed. This is the bottom line. If a theory makes a claim, then it needs to prove it. The theory of evolution is the only theory in the realm of science that is given a free ride.

And that was not a third question, but a reiteration of the two points of contention that I proclaimed in the beginning.

Quote

If you want answers to the actual scientific theory on explain how Earth had the compounds to produce life you would have to seek out astronomist.

No, astronomy did not engender the threory of evolution. That is the realm of biology, and so I put forth my demand for proof from those who made the claim.

Quote

Just briefly off topic some scientist introduce the theory that in the prehistoric times the Earth (prior to the existence of dinosaurs) was bombarded by meteors and comets and these introduce the life giving compositions in earth. Hydrogen, Oxygen and Carbon dioxide (including other gases) including bacteria were all compositions in the order of creation of life.

speculation. which takes "faith" to believe in.

And if true, still does not prove that mutations give rise to speciation.

Quote

Evolution does not explain how life develops but how organisms evolve and adapt. Two different theories here.

Poppycok! Evolution proclaims that the changes which are seen as adaptations prove that mutations cause speciation, which also, supposedly proves that a cell formed in a goo which gave us birds and man and apes and fish.

I agree that evolution cannot tell us how life began, but evolutionists do claim that life started from a series of mutations, which came, somehow, from nothing.

Quote

evolution fails to explain the very basics of "cellular" evolution because it fails to show

just how complicated systems came into being. As an example, the blood clotting system. The blood clotting system must have two essential components: clotting at the right time and place. If not, the system will die. It is that simple. The blood clotting system is extremely complicated, and it is also in the most simplistic form (you cannot take away or add to it). To use the idea of cellular evolution would only show the extreme weakness of the theory and the reason why evolution is a "dead end". If you say that the blood clotting system came into being through random mutations, then you must show how the system worked with only a one or two or a few basic elements. Of course this would be impossible given that nothing can be taken away or added without destroying the system thus killing the organism. The system is "irreducible". The chances that the system "just" came into being from some huge random dice roll is impossible.

Brother Andalus your asking questions that seem to show you have no real knowledge on evolution.

I beg to differ. I just presented you with a huge dilemma for evolution. In the past, evolutionists had an easy ride with just showing how certain things resemble one another, and it was easy to make connections (based upon supposition). But late in the 20th century, molecular biology grew as did biochemistry, and behold, evolution begins to fail. Mutations occur at the molecular level, according to evolutionists, because change must take place at the molecular level. Irreducible complex systems exist in biological systems, and these systems cannot have evolved, and the chances that they just appeared are impossible. Perhaps brother, you are not up on the details that accompany the idea of evolution.

Quote

After reading Charles Darwin's book in college (including updated material) I don't think Darwin's theory was to show the complexity of cellular division rather, to show how organisms evolved in certain conditions and to show how this occurred.

That's because science did not know anything about the realm of molecular biology. Watson and Crick were far from gracing the earth. Ignorance on the part of Darwin does not invalidate my point. Adaptations simply are no big deal, and do not prove that life came from a single cell. I am aware of what Darwin proposed, but Darwin's theories fail to predict or explain phenomena that is continuously being discovered.

His disciples just revent his wheel, and continue to update it, and proudly boust how his theories have held up.

Quote

Later retuned explanations showed how "genetic drift" plays a role in this development. I'm surprised you didn't read that part. The complexity of the blood clotting system has nothing to do with evolution and everything to do with the physiological structure.

Are you kidding? Nothing to do with evolution????? Brother.....are you so entangled in this horrible theory that you are being loyal or are you truly not connecting the dots?

The ideas on genetic drift is another realm that is useless as long as nothing in the thoery is able to show how the systems of the organsim evolved. An organism cannot have evolved if it has an irreducible complex system. It is on the theory to provide answers.

Do you understand what takes place in the clotting system? I would be happy to go into details.

Quote The basis of natural selection was that species that were able to adapt into a certain environment thrived versus those that didn't. The species that survived passed on their genes which produced offspring wiht the same genetic composition as the the previous.

I am aware of what adaption is, and I am aware that it does not prove speciation or that life started from nothing (a metaphysical idea at the bases of evolution), and I am also aware that natural selection cannot show how irreducible complex systems emerged.

Quote

A good example are the Gallapgos (I might have mutilated that name) Island birds.

Darwin spent some years looking at these birds. On the Island when it rains the seeds that the birds eat in the trees shrink therefore large beak birds are unable to pick the seeds up, but smaller beak birds are able to therefore, the large beak birds eventually starve and die while the smaller beak birds survive. During a dry spell it is the opposite. Because the seeds become too large the large beak birds thrive and small beak birds die off.

I am aware of this story. My reply: So what? What do the Dallas Cowboys have to do with the price of bannanas in Nicaragua. My point being, that a bird with a different size beaks does not prove speciation.....something jumped from a reptile to a mammal.....a cell mutating into a larger creature....a beast mutating into a human..etc, etc. I do not disagree that some adaptation takes place, I do find it to be a fallacy to try and stretch this as a proof for the entirety of evolution.

Quote

Once more, none of this supports that founding ideas of evolution. I have personally heard supporters and scientists state that macro changes (adaptation) automatically gives "micro" (different species forming, life from nothing, etc). This is a fallacy.

Now I feel like I'm going back to highschool with this but all life comes from a single celled organism, this has been proven.

Actually, you might check out what a proof is and is not. And assertion with weak speculation and adaptation examples do not prove that a cell started all life. And while you are finding your proof, also explain how the irreducible system of blood clotting was able to evolve.

Quote

Since this transformation (e.g. from water animals to land animals) all humans have one ancestor that descended from the central southern regions of Africa. From this came the migration eastward in to the Eurasian continents. From thousands upon thousands of years (maybe hundreds of thousands) came the development of different adaptations. Humans began to change. It is obvious from the different types of ethnic groups and skin pigmentations you would think this is the case. I mean Andalus come

on. All humans share the same genetic stuff so how would you would theorize how we are so externally different?

You are simply preaching Brother! I know what the claim is, the problem is that there is no proof for this claim. Of course humans share common "stuff", we are all human!

Quote

Come on brother!!!! lol

ditto!

A feeling of discouragement when you slip up is a sure sign that you put your faith in deeds. -Ibn 'Ata'llah

<http://www.sunnipath.com>

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/>

<http://www.pt-go.com/>

Back to Top

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 29 September 2007 at 12:19am

I'll respond shortly

Back to Top

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 29 September 2007 at 7:06pm

Andalus your post are in bold

LOL...yes of course I am saying two things, I even numbered them as two things, one and two. Two points that evolution fails to prove or even predict (a "real" scientific theory should make predictions, evolution has not been able to predict anything, and being a "tautology", it always agrees with everything after the fact!).

My question was actually a proposition: evolution fails on two major points, and the proponents like to hide behind the banner of "adaption" to promote the theory, but the novice usually fails to see the smoking mirrors and see that adaptation does not prove the bases of evolution: life came from nothing, and mutations cause speciation.

Thanks for addressing me in that manner now I must become hostile with you. Recently I've been developing my dissertation for my PH.D. (along with work) and have not had time to actual put forthought into this discussion (which is the last thing on my priority list) so bear with me. I have to ask you Andalus to what extent of knowledge do you have of evolution? I mean, your response was atypical of someone who is knowledgable of evolution especially more indepth in the molecular level so I have to ask how much do you reall know?

To ask the questions:

- 1) life started in some goo of organic compounds
- 2) that speciation occured (something becoming a reptile and a mammal for instance)

Didn't make sense because the following analogy:

because an elephant, isolated on a island over time becomes small, does not imply, that 1 or 2 are true, which is at the heart of evolution.

Either was not properly written or was not well thought out. Instead of making this long drawn out post let us cover the two main themes of your statement.

1)life started in some goo of organic compounds

Just so I'm not "preaching to you" allow me to elaborate what you are saying here. Obviously, you are referring to the Primordial Soup theory. For those of you who may be reading don't know basically what this theory states is life began in a pond or ocean as a result of the combination of chemicals from the atmosphere and some form of energy to make amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, which would then evolve into all the species.

How evolution played a role in the Primordial Soup Theory

-Andalus are you familiar with the Russian Chemist, A.I. Oparin and Haldane? (This is just for kicks and giggles)

-Basically what follows here is that the basic building blocks of life came from simple molecule which formed in the atmosphere without the existence of oxygen. This was then actualized by lightning and the rain from the atmosphere created the "organic soup". The first organisms would have to be simple heterotrophs in order to survive by consuming other organisms for energy before means of photosynthesis. They would become autotrophs by mutation (an element in evolution).

Obvious problems covered in this theory

1) Amino acids have to become protein

2) Hitting the right protein is very difficult

3) Amino acids are building blocks not the assembled structures

4) The early atmosphere contained early gases methane and ammonia which were gases that encompassed earth well before oxygen.

5) Cannot spontaneously generate protein

So although this theory (also revised later by Muller?) it is just a theory and there is not enough physical evidence to support it. Evolutionists are fanatical about this theory because of the existence of mutated organic substances. Now in the realm of science what is more likely to be measured? God created the world out of a void or, organic compounds that can be studied to its earliest form? Although this theory is still a theory it still provides the groundwork for later discoveries.

Again, Creationists do no better by simply saying a "designer created the world out of a void" why? Because faith cannot be measured. God is incorporeal and cannot be measured so in the case of Ockham's Razor what is more plausible here?

2) that speciation occurred (something becoming a reptile and a mammal for instance)

In reference to this question like the previous one I just answered I turn to the concept of "biological evolution" which is something I should have indicated in my previous post to discern the different types of evolution. When it comes to Speciation my friend to understand this you must also confront the four types of speciation: allopatric, peripatric, parapatric and sympatric. Do you deny that all of these are false? To assume you have a novice's understanding of speciation and these four processes I will not go into detail to not sound like I'm "preaching to the choir."

However it is important to note that in these four processes comes the result of the differentiation of species. The following is an explanation on the various types of Reproductive Isolation:

Types of Reproductive Isolation

There are many barriers to reproduction. Each species may have its own courtship displays, or breeding season, so that members of the two species do not have the opportunity to interbreed. Or, the two species may be unable to interbreed successfully because of failure of the egg to become fertilized or to develop.

This suggests a simple and useful dichotomy, between pre-mating or prezygotic (i.e., pre-zygote formation) reproductive isolating mechanisms, and post-mating or postzygotic isolating mechanisms. Remember that a zygote is the cell formed by the union of two gametes and is the basis of a developing individual.

Prezygotic isolating mechanisms

Ecological isolation: Species occupy different habitats. The lion and tiger overlapped in India until 150 years ago, but the lion lived in open grassland and the tiger in forest. Consequently, the two species did not hybridize in nature (although they sometimes do in zoos).

Temporal isolation: Species breed at different times. In North America, five frog species of the genus *Rana* differ in the time of their peak breeding activity.

Behavioral isolation: Species engage in distinct courtship and mating rituals.

Mechanical isolation: Interbreeding is prevented by structural or molecular blockage of the formation of the zygote. Mechanisms include the inability of the sperm to bind to the egg in animals, or the female reproductive organ of a plant preventing the wrong pollinator from landing.

Postzygotic isolating mechanisms

Hybrid inviability. Development of the zygote proceeds abnormally and the hybrid is aborted. (For instance, the hybrid egg formed from the mating of a sheep and a goat will die early in development.)

Hybrid sterility. The hybrid is healthy but sterile. (The mule, the hybrid offspring of a donkey and a mare, is sterile; it is unable to produce viable gametes because the chromosomes inherited from its parents do not pair and cross over correctly during meiosis (cell division in which two sets of chromosomes of the parent cell are reduced to a single set in the products, termed gametes - see Figure).

Hybrid is healthy and fertile, but less fit, or infertility appears in later generations (as witnessed in laboratory crosses of fruit flies, where the offspring of second-generation hybrids are weak and usually cannot produce viable offspring).

**** Post-zygotic mechanisms are those in which hybrid zygotes fail, develop abnormally, or cannot self-reproduce and establish viable populations in nature. ****

So species remain distinct due to reproductive isolation. But how do species form in the first place?

An abbreviated illustration of meiosis, by which reproductive cells duplicate to form gametes.

<http://www.globalchange.umich.edu/globalchange1/current/lectures/speciation/speciation.html>

Ever heard of Cladogenesis brother Analdus?

You know the one species develops into two or more through adaptation. Also plays a role in the evolution of organic species. Remember the Galapagos Island analogy that you found so irrelevant? Actually that was quite relevant to explain the validity behind evolution. Evolutionist may note in regards to species, an isolated population branches off from its ancestral species when it has accumulated a number of significant, independent variations that differentiate it from the original species.

What's so interesting about Cladogenesis is that Cladogenesis explains the development of a large assortment of species from a smaller set of ancestral species through evolution. Unlike anagenesis, speciation through cladogenesis does not require the extinction of the ancestral population. Through successive cladogenetic splits, either with or without the extinction of the ancestral population, the total number of species increases over time. Cladogenesis is probably a more common form of evolution and speciation than anagenesis [See: Stanford Encyclopedia]. In case you don't know what is the concept of anagenesis it is when the population of an entire species changes on a genetic level without a split.

Evolution gains another pillar of support when we find convergence between multiple phylogenies developed by multiple, independent means. For instance, the convergence between phylogeny developed from genetics and phylogeny developed from morphological characteristics of fossils.

Convergence between genetics and fossils aren't the only relevant convergences to speak of, however. I recently read an example of convergence between two genetically-derived phylogenies: The common pocket gopher (family Geomyidae) and species of the genus *Geomydoecus*, their pubic lice. As it state sin the following:

"Phylogenies based on mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase I (COI) sequences for 15 taxa of gophers and 15 species of *Geomydoecus* show considerable congruence (Fig. 2). More detailed comparisons of these phylogenies revealed that 8 of the 12 ingroup nodes (67%) show potential cospeciation events (Page and Hafner, 1996). This amount of cospeciation is more than expected by chance alone ($P < 0.01$; reconciliation analysis, as implemented in TreeMap 1; Page, 1995). These comparisons indicate that cospeciation between gophers and lice is extensive."

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 30 September 2007 at 1:47am

In addition

Although I'm a firm believer in God the Creator I am a firm disbeliever in Creationism for the simple fact that Creationism, does not explain God. Creationism (quite differently from the Islamic perspective) does explain who "the Designer" is. How is this designer different from the Demiurge? Or different from some super intelligent space alien? The burden of proof is on the Creationist not the Evolutionist.

Back to Top

minuteman View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 25 March 2007

Status: Offline

Points: 1642 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote minuteman Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 20 October 2007 at 1:42am

I have no knowledge about these subjects. But I will soon try to study a part of it. I

was wondering from the religious point of view. Allah is the Creator. The word used is "Khalaq" in Arabic. I wonder if there is any mention of a word for evolution too.

Even though genes may be working making changes, but genes were made or provided (created) by Allah in the scheme of things.

The theory of evolution has three important steps:

1. Origin of Species 2. Natural selection 3. Survival of the fittest.

I feel that number 1 and 3 are possible. But the number 2 is the odd one out. Just by natural or unnatural selection, the body parts do not fit into action, i.e. just by chance the things get joined together and make a man or a tiger.

We have eyes and the optical chord takes the optical signals to the right place in the brain where message is analysed. The eye ball, the nerves, the memory cells all work together at high speed and bring about a visual result.

I will rather leave this subject to the two learned men. Thanks.

[Back to Top](#)

[Hammy07 View Drop Down](#)

[Starter](#)

[Starter](#)

[Avatar](#)

[Joined: 07 July 2008](#)

[Location: United Kingdom](#)

[Status: Offline](#)

[Points: 4](#) [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Hammy07](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#) [ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
[Posted: 07 July 2008 at 7:41pm](#)

Evolution explains a lot. Creationism explains nothing.

I find it peculiar, creationism tries to solve the complexity of life, by inventing something even more complex: God.

You can't then ignore that logic when it comes to God.

Darwin was right, it's painful for a lot of people, but he was right. I mean, come on, if he was wrong about us having a common ancestor with monkeys and apes, it seems remarkably coincidental then, that nearly a century later, it's been proven beyond any doubt at all, that our closest genetic relatives, are indeed, monkeys and apes. There are millions of other species that COULD have been more similar to us, thus proving Darwin wrong.

It's the same science used to determine whether or not someone is your long lost brother or sister, you determine if they have a common 'ancestor' ie. father. And applying the same science to species reveals that we have a common ancestor with members of the ape world.

I also hear a lot of nonsense about the probability of life. For example, "the chances of life occurring are 1 in 10 (insert 'illion number) from people who A) don't understand probability and B) don't understand physics

Most major discoveries we have made with regards to the universe has been one of scale. That is, we used to think we have the only planet, the sun goes round us, and stars were just pointless little dots. Then we discovered the earth actually went round the sun. We then learned that stars are actually suns, and our sun, is nothing special, a fairly average sun. We still thought however that our galaxy consisted of all the stars in the universe. We then learnt that our galaxy is but one of countless billions, of which ours is nothing spectacular.

See the progression? We currently think there is only one universe. It is likely there are trillions. Exploding into existence, collapsing, as numerous, and frequently, as stars are made and destroyed.

If that's the case, life is not a big deal, in fact, a very basic form of life is very probably sooner or later with millions of universes, it's evolution is perfectly natural too. Gravity at the atomic level, mass, create conflict, conflict creates competition, competition

creates natural selection. All these forces are all that's needed for life to occur at a primitive pre-cellular level.

The lottery has 14 million possible combinations. If I secretly posted all 14 million combinations on tickets, to 14 million different people, one of them would definitely win the jackpot. It is guaranteed. The millions who don't win, would just think it was a little weird being sent a ticket, and then just forget about it as a non-incident. The person who wins the jackpot though, would be hard-pressed not to think it was some kind of miracle, and be convinced that someone must know the lottery numbers, or be able to prophesise them, or maybe it was sent by God. What are the chances of being sent the right lottery numbers she'd think...well, 100% that someone would receive it, why not her.

There are probably billions of universes, if some of them were to have life...why not ours?

Inventing a 'creator' is a human response. Our brains are purpose driven, we make tools, we engineer things to suit ourselves, so we then invented the ultimate version of OURSELVES: God, to explain the purpose of everything, when in fact, there is no purpose to explain. We fashioned God into the ultimate version of Iron-Age man, can do anything, kill anyone, conquer anything, and be worshipped as a King, and deservedly so, and refusal meets torture and punishment. God is simply what Iron Age man aspired to be, both it's good side and it's horrific side.